

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/658,617	MITCHELL ET AL.
	Examiner David Guzo	Art Unit 1636

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** After Final

(1) David Guzo. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Rochelle K. Seide. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 23 October 2006

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

*All*

Prior art documents discussed:

*None*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called applicants' representative to inquire as to the Objection to the Specification issue outstanding in the case and whether applicants filed a Notice of Appeal. Applicants' representative indicated that they did not file a Notice of Appeal and since the After Final response filed 10/12/06 (last day of the SIX month period for response) did not resolve all the issues, the case is abandoned. Applicants' representative indicated that they would petition to revive the application. .